

Post-graduate and Research Department Series No. 25

“Professor K. V. Abhyankar Memorial Lectures”

[THIRD SERIES]

**BHARTRHARI'S VĀKYAPADĪYA
AND
LINGUISTIC MONISM**

BISHNUPADA BHATTACHARYA

**Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
Poona, India**

1985

24.
Post-graduate and Research Department Series No. 25

“Professor K. V. Abhyankar Memorial Lectures”

[THIRD SERIES]

**BHARTṚHARI'S VĀKYAPADĪYA
AND
LINGUISTIC MONISM**

BISHNUPADA BHATTACHARYA

**Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
Poona, India
1985**

Bishnupada Bhattacharya

BHARTRHARI'S VĀKYAPADĪYA
AND
LINGUISTIC MONISM

Printed at :

The Bhandarkar Institute Press,
Poona 411 004, India.

Published by :

R. N. Dandekar, Honorary Secretary,
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute,
Poona 411 004, India.

FOREWORD

On March 17-19, 1985, Professor Bishnupada Bhattacharya delivered at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, the *Professor K. V. Abhyankar Memorial Lectures* (Third Series) on "Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* and Linguistic Monism : A Philosophical Study" and "Linguistic Speculations in Sanskrit Poetics". His two lectures on the first theme are being published in this volume, which, though tiny in size, is, I believe, profound in contents.

Professor Bhattacharya, who has had the advantage of both traditional and modern training, served as Principal of the Government Sanskrit College, Calcutta, for a fairly long time, and is at present Research Professor in the Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, Calcutta. His main field of work may be said to be Sanskrit language and grammar – or, to put it more specifically, the *Nirukta* of Yāska. In his well-known book, *Yāska's Nirukta and the Science of Etymology* (Calcutta, 1958), Professor Bhattacharya has sought, among other things, to give a complete picture of the pre-Yāska stage of the etymological science and an account of the eminent etymologists who were the first originators of that branch of study. He has also ably discussed such problems as those relating to Yāska and Śākalya, Yāska's authorship of *Nighaṇṭu*, the recensions of the *Nirukta*, the lost treatise *Niruktavārttika*, the authors of the *Nairukta* school, and the different schools of Vedic interpretation. A mention needs to be made here also of Professor Bhattacharya's *A Study in Language and Meaning* (Calcutta, 1962) in which he has critically examined some aspects of Indian semantics. Incidentally I am here reminded of an interesting paper on "Tagore's aesthetics in the light of the Upaniṣads", which Professor Bhattacharya has recently contributed to the *Souvenir* of the 30th All India Oriental Conference (Santiniketan, 1980),

Therein he has shown how Tagore constantly uses Upanisadic terms and concepts, like *prakāśa*, *līlā*, *rūpa*, etc., to elucidate his views on art and how he emphasizes that the aim of art is essentially spiritual perfection (*āmasaṁskṛtīr vāra śīpāni* - *At. Br.* 6, 27). We were, indeed, happy and thankful to have had a scholar of Professor Bhattacharya's stature as this year's "Abhyankar Lecturer".

In the present lectures, Professor Bhattacharya has turned his searchlight on the philosophy of language. It is hoped that they will suitably supplement the lectures delivered by Professor K. A. Subramania Iyer, under this very lectureship and on more or less the same theme, five years ago.

Bhandarkar Oriental
Research Institute,
Poona

November 26, 1985

R. N. Dandekar

*Creative Role of the Goddess Vāc in the Ṛgveda*² the late Professor W. Norman Brown admirably analysed the various meta-physical concepts relating to Vāc and the means of realising her essence and observed *en passant* :

“ Thus the chain of creation is complete. Vāc produced the raw-material of the universe, the means for organising it, and taught the gods how to use that means. The capstone of the process was the provision that the instruction should be imparted to men so that they could constantly renew creation and thus perpetuate the existence of the universe.”

Of course this esoteric conception of Vāc as traceable in the Ṛgvedic hymns is a good deal removed from the meta-physical conception of *śabda-brahman* as interpreted by Bhartṛhari and his followers, though the author of the *Mahābhāṣya* alludes to several *mantra*-s of the Ṛgveda itself where they are interpreted as representing *śabda* or speech as *maho devaḥ*, the Supreme God, residing in the mortals, from the standpoint of the Philosophy of Grammar. Still, inspite of this long evolutionary background Bhartṛhari's contribution to the concept of speech as the only absolute principle forming the very basis of this phenomenal universe is unique by virtue of its metaphysical subtlety and sublimity. With a view to establishing his philosophical tenet relating to *śabda* as *Brahman*, Bhartṛhari posits three stages in the evolution of *śabda* from the *paśyantī*, through *madhyamā*, the intermediate, ending in *vaikharī*, the audible crude stage, with which we laymen are directly concerned. The grammatical systems including that of Pāṇini, which are busy with the analysis of spoken words, justly attach the greatest importance to the *vaikharī* form of speech. And some scholars are of opinion that the three *kāṇḍa*-s of Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* relate themselves respectively to the three gradually evolving stages of *Vāk* - viz. *paśyantī*, *madhyamā* and *vaikharī*, in consonance with his meta-

2. In *Pratidānam | Indian, Iranian and Indo-European Studies | Presented to Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus Kuiper On His Sixtieth Birthday |* Mouton : The Hague : 1968 : pp. 393-397.

physical outlook. I would like, in this connection, to quote the observations of the late Professor K. A. S. Iyer, bearing on this issue, which will not be out of place in this context :

“ Is it an accident that, just as *Vāk* has three stages, so has *Vākyapadīya* which is, after all, a treatise on *Vāk*, three *Kāṇḍas*? Would it be seeing too much in Bhartṛhari to say that he intended *Paśyantī* to be the chief subject-matter of the first *Kāṇḍa*, *Madhyamā* that of the second *Kāṇḍa* and *Vaikharī* that of the third *Kāṇḍa*? The first chapter is called *Brahmakāṇḍa*. Brahman is the undifferentiated ultimate reality to which *Paśyantī* is very near. The indivisible sentence and sentence-meaning form the main subject-matter of the second *Kāṇḍa*. Thus differentiation into word and meaning has taken place, but each is still a unity. There is some differentiation, but the unity is also preserved. Would it be mere fancy, to see in it a correspondence to the *Madhyamā* stage? We saw in the third *Kāṇḍa*, we are entirely in the realm of analysis and differentiation which is just the characteristic of the *Vaikharī*. That all is not pure imagination and that Bhartṛhari might have meant his three *Kāṇḍas* to be representative of the three stages of *Vāk* is confirmed by one of the concluding stanzas of Helārāja's commentary on the third *Kāṇḍa*. In it, he definitely looks upon the third *Kāṇḍa* as the *Vaikharī*. He prays that this stage of *Vāk*, the *Vaikharī*, should become well-established among all men through his commentary. We do not have his commentary on the first two *Kāṇḍas*. So we cannot say whether he identified them with the *Paśyantī* and *Madhyamā* or not.

“ Whether Bhartṛhari intended to emphasise one stage of *Vāk* in each *Kāṇḍa* or not it is remarkable that he is ever conscious, right through the *Vākyapadīya* of the *Brahman-śabdātattva* out of which the whole phenomenal world

emanates. It runs like a thread through the work and gives it a kind of unity.”³

3. Prof. K. A. Subrahmanya Iyer : *Sanskrit and the Philosophy of Language in Proceedings of the First International Sanskrit Conference*, Vol. II, Part II, pp. 77-78 (Ed. Prof. V. Raghavan / Ministry of Education and Social Welfare / Govt. of India / New Delhi / India / 1976). The verse of Helārāja, referred to above in the course of this quotation, is :

nirūkāṅkṣeṇa vapuṣā gatā viśva-janīnatām |
trītiyā vāg-avastheyam pratiṣṭhām upayūyitaḥ ||

— occurring at the end of his commentary *Prakīrṇa-prakāśa* on the *Pada-kāṇḍa* of the *Vākyapadīya*. It may also be pointed out in this connection that Abhinavagupta at the end of the commentary *Locana* on each of the four *Uddyotas* of *Dhvanyāloka* similarly invokes the four different manifestations of *Vāk* according to their order of evolution.

In this context, a reference might be made to the problem of three-fold division of *Vāk* as found in Bhartr̥hari's *Vākyapadīya* *vis-à-vis* the four-fold one by the addition of *parā* as the highest stage as found in the works of Nāgeśa. We cite below the cogent observations of late Dr. K. C. Pandey, which might be of interest to serious students of the history of development of philosophical speculations in India :

“Somānanda was a younger contemporary of Vasugupta. He made a definitely rationalistic approach to the problem of Ultimate Reality. He distinctly refers to various schools of thought and rationally proves the unsoundness of their theories. His attacks are directed primarily against *Śabda-brahma-vāda* of the grammarians and the *śaktyadvaya-vāda* of a section of Kāśmīra Śaivas. He refuted the theory propounded by Bhartr̥hari (A. D. 650) in his *Vākyapadīyam*, that *paśyantī* is the Ultimate, *parā*. He established *parā* to be distinct from *paśyantī*.

“The earlier grammarians accepted only one stage of transition. The *madhyamā*, from the subtlest speech (*paśyantī*) to the grossest (*vaikharī*). In Kaiyaṭa's *Pradīpa*, we find a different interpretation of these Vedic passages (*catvāri śṛṅgā* etc.) which are interpreted by Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa, in his *Uddyota*, as implying *parā*. Recognition of *parā*, as distinct from *paśyantī*, by Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa and his followers, was due to the influence of the *Śaiva-Āgamas*. Thus, the contribution of Somānanda to the philosophy of Grammar is the establishment of *parā* as distinct from and higher than *paśyantī*. The *parā* is recognised by the Śaivas as identical with what they call *avatantra* or *vimarśa*.” — K. C. Pandey : *History of Philosophy : Eastern and Western*, Vol. I, p. 382. Also : “I may take liberty to suggest here that philosophy of grammar, built upon the basis of Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* by the great savant Bhartr̥hari, was affiliated to the Āgama Literature akin to Saiva and

(Continued on next page)

IV

Now Bhartṛhari, in keeping with his monistic outlook, identifies the phenomenal universe in all its diversity with the ultimate principle – which according to him is *Vāk* as *Paśyantī*. At that stage there is no difference between *Word* and *Meaning* – *śabda* and *artha*. As he says :

*ekasyaivātmano bhedaḥ śabdārthāḥ aprthaksthitaḥ*⁴

Just as in the yolk within the peacock's egg the diverse forms and colours of the plumes are present in an undifferentiated state, similarly within the womb of *Paśyantī* the phenomenal universe with all its endless varieties of colour, taste, form and smell, touch and sound is dormant in an undifferentiated state in complete identity with *Vāk* – the creative principle. Gradually in the course of evolution *Vāk* loses its pristine purity and subtlety manifesting itself as *madhyamā* and *vaikharī*, which last alone is looked upon as speech proper by laymen, uninitiated into the true essence of *Vāk*, and constitutes the medium of our day-to-day communication. *Vāk* as *paśyantī* is beyond the comprehension of ordinary worldly beings labouring under the spell of nescience (*avidyā*) that presents unity as diversity, one as many, and hypostatizes our inner states of cognition as meanings (*artha*) with an intrinsic and independent existence of their own in the world outside and as such real, without being affected by any verbal or non-verbal element. Thus *avidyā* plays a vital role in

(Continued from previous page)

Sākta āgamas of Kashmir.' – Mm. Pt. Gopinath Kaviraj. Regarding the threefold level of *vāk* as recognised by Bhartṛhari and the possible recognition of *parā vāk* at the highest level Harold G. Coward's *Bhartṛhari*, Chapter 2, Section IV (' Levels of Language in the Vākyapadiya ') might be consulted (Twayne Publishers U. S. A. 1976) in Twayne's World Author Series.

4. Cf. " To the Grammarian the thought is the same as the object, with this difference that the former is an internal, while the latter is only an external aspect of one and the same Reality." – Mm. Pt. Gopinath Kaviraj. Thought in its abstract aspect is Universal in itself while as concrete it is Universal as manifested in the Individual.

the metaphysical conception of the grammarians of the school of Bhartṛhari, a role similar to that ascribed to it by Vedāntins of the school of Śaṅkara. Bhartṛhari, in his auto-commentary on *Vākyapadīya* I. i – viz. :

*anādinidhanaṃ brahma śabdatattvaṃ yad akṣaram |
vivartate 'rthabhāvena prakriyā jagato yataḥ ||*

quotes the following two *kārikā*-s from some unknown source with the prefatory remark : '*tathā hy uktam*', that have an ineffable Vedāntic tinge in them – viz. :

*yathā viśuddham ākāśam timiropapluto janaḥ |
saṃkīrṇam iva mātṛābhiś citrābhir abhimanyate ||
tathedam amṛtam brahma nirvikāram avidyayā |
kaluṣatvam ivāpannam bhedarūpaṃ vivartate ||⁵*

Here the occurrence of the term *avidyā* in close conjunction with *vivartate* is significant. In several other places also Bhartṛhari has made use of the term *avidyā*, while referring to the principle of differentiation and diversification of the world of meanings from the absolute, unitary and undifferentiated *Vāk*, constituting the very basis of the analytic procedure adopted by the Science of

5. Cf. "The following two verses in the *svopajñā-ṭikā* of Bhartṛhari on *Vā Pa* I. 1 : "*yathā... vivartate*" have been paraphrased by Diñnāga in his *Traikūṭya-parīkṣā* (verses 31-320 " which is available only in Tibetan translation and not in Sanskrit. It is interesting to note that Diñnāga has paraphrased Bhartṛhari's verses. It is closely to be examined.... It is likely that *śabda-brahma-vāda* of Bhartṛhari is not of his own innovation " according to N. A. Shastri, the great Buddhist scholar of Viśva-Bhāratī, Santiniketan. " – *Vākyapadīya of Śrī Bhartṛhari* : Ed. by Prof. K. A. V. Abhyankar and Acarya V. P. Limaye, Second Suppliment to Appendix III, p. 352 (University of Poona, Sanskrit and Prakrit Series, Poona, 1965). In this connection it may be noted that *śabda-brahma-vāda* was also accepted by Maṇḍana Miśra, who in his *vṛtti* on *Brahma-siddhi*, I. 1, hints at this doctrine. Cf.

*brahmaṇaḥ śabdātmatvatvaṃ na kevalaṃ bhagavato Bhartṛharer eva
sammatam iti bhramitavyam | ācārya-Maṇḍana-Miśra caraṇair apt
svapraṇīta-brahmasiddhi-granthe ' brahmakāṇḍastha-prathamapādyā
ntargatasya yūktara-pādasya | vyākhyāvasare brahmaṇaḥ śabdātmatā
pratipūditā - 'akṣaram iti śabdātmatām āhe' - tyādi-granthena |*

– Mm, Pt. Harancandra Sāstrī in his *Kāla-siddhānta-darśinī*, p. 25, f. n.

Grammar (*vyākaraṇāgama*) for a description of the nature of speech in its *Vaikharī* form as made use of for the purpose of our self-expression and mutual communication. As he states : (VP. II. 233. + III. 14. 78) :

*śāstreṣu prakriyā-bhedair avidyāvopavarṇyate /
anāgama-vikalpā tu svayam vidyopavarṇyate /**

Here *Vyākaraṇa* as *śāstra* is announced emphatically as being related to *avidyā*, though ultimately it leads to *vidyā* or true knowledge leading to comprehension of *Vāk* as *paśyantī*. Similarly in the section *Kāla-samuddeśa* both these terms *vidyā* and *avidyā* are found to be used in mutual opposition in the following *kārikā* :

*śaktyātma-devatā-pakṣair bhinnam kālasya darśanam /
prathamam tad avidyāyām yad vidyāyām na vidyate ||*

Not only common people alone working under nescience fail to comprehend the true essence of things, not to speak of *Vāk* as the ultimate creative principle, while employing *Vaikharī* as the medium of their communication, even seers, who have a glimpse of the essence of Reality as such, must *ipso facto* have to come down to the level of common people while expressing themselves through articulate speech in the act of communication, because communication is impossible in the stage of direct apprehension of Reality, where there is no trace of differentiation of any sort, which is, however, the very basis of all communicative acts in the mundane level. This has been emphasised again and again in more than one place of the *Vākyapadīya*. In the following *kārikā* of the *Sambandha-samuddeśa* section the doctrine of the *trayyanta-vedins*, the doctors who are the masters of the teachings of the Upaniṣads or the Vedānta, has been unambiguously stated : (VP. III. 3. 72) :

*yatra draṣṭā ca dṛśyaṃ ca darśanam vāvikalpitam /
tasyaivārthasya satyatvam śritās trayyanta-vedināḥ ||**

So also in the fourth *kārikā* of *Brahma-kāṇḍa*, the three-fold differentiation of the Absolute into *bhoktr*, *bhoktavya* and *bhoga*

has been declared as the product of nescience that has its validity only in the plane of our mundane existence viz. :

*ekasya sarva-bījasya yasya ceyam anekadhā |
bhoktr-bhoktavya-rūpeṇa bhogarūpeṇa ca sthitiḥ ||*

Thus in the stage of our worldly existence, in the *vyavahārasā*, the seer, who has realised the essential Being, is on the same level with the common run of people, labouring under nescience, as both have to make use of *śabda* as *Vaikharī*, where difference between the verbal element and the meaning expressed by it is taken for granted, which is nothing but *vikalpa*. As Bharṭṛhari emphatically declares : (VP. II. 130)

*ṛṣṇām darśanam yac ca tattve kiñcid avasthitam |
na tena vyavahāro 'sti na tac chabdanibandhanam ||*

Similarly :

*rūpaṇa-vyapadeśābhyām laukike vartmani sthitau |
jñānam pratyabhilāpam ca sadṛśau bāla-pañḍitau ||**
(VP. III. 3. 55)

Śaṅkara seems to echo the statements of Bharṭṛhari in his oft-quoted saying occurring in his *Śārīraka-bhāṣya* on the very first aphorism of the *Brahma-sūtra* – viz. :

*tasmād avidyāvad-viśayāṇy eva pratyakṣādīni
pramāṇāni śāstrāṇi ca | paśvādibhiś cāviśeṣāt ||*

In his *Bhāṣya* on the *Gītā*, XIII. 2 Śaṅkara similarly observes :

*bandhāvasthāyām eva śāstrādy-arthavattvam,
na muktāvasthāyām ||*

V

But it might be asked : If Absolute Reality is one without a second, and if the diversity, sequence, appearance and disappearance as experienced in the phenomenal universe is but a shadow having its genesis in the cosmic nescience that obstructs

our vision, how does Brahman *qua* Word in the system of Bhartṛhari manifest itself as many even though One, as occurring in sequence even though by Itself beyond all sequence and ever-existent, as arranged in time and space even though Itself non-temporal and non-spatial in character, as subject and object, as cogniser and the thing cognised, as the expressive word and the meaning expressed thereby and similar other hypostatizations, even though by itself It is indivisible? The question is a fundamental one that confronts every monistic conception of metaphysics in some form or other. The Vedānta as interpreted by Śaṅkara has sought the help of *māyā* for explanation of plurality and other appearances in the world of phenomena. Bhartṛhari has tried to explain it by having recourse to the concept of *śakti* or power inherent in *śabda-brahman*. In the very second *kārikā* of *Vākya-padīya*, *Brahma-kāṇḍa*, which is also called *Āgama-samuccaya*, Bhartṛhari declares in an unambiguous way:

ekam eva yad āmnātaṁ bhinnam śakti-vyapāśrayāt |
*aprthaktve 'pi śaktibhyaḥ prthaktvena ca vartate ||*⁶

Thus, though *śabda-brahman* is One without a second, It manifests Itself as distinct and manifold, having an independent status as it were, through the working of various powers or potencies inherent in Itself. These potencies are of diverse sorts, some of which are direct and others indirect, and though they are identical with *śabda-brahman*, they seem to be different from It. In truth, *śabda-brahman* is a totality of potencies which have no separate independent being of their own apart from their

6. Compare: "*śabdeṣu evāśritā śaktir viśvavyūṣya nibandhanī |*
yan-netraḥ pratibhūtmāyaṁ bhedarūpaḥ pratiyate ||

— *Vākya-padīya*, I. 118. "Bhartṛhari has used the word *śakti* (power) altogether 109 times in his work in different contexts. According to the Vaiśeṣika system of philosophy, time, space, direction, *Samavāya* (inherence), action etc. are substances and different categories (*padārtha*). But Hari calls them all powers. For him the entire universe is bundle of powers. The Brahman (neut.), according to him, possesses unlimited powers and as a matter of fact the Brahman (neut.) is not different from the powers...." — S. S. Peri, *loc. cit.*, p. 75,

substratum which is One, Indivisible and Eternal. As Bhartṛhari states in another context in the second *kārikā* of the *Sādhana-samuddeśa* section of the third *Kāṇḍa* of the *Vākyapadīya* :

śaktimātrā-samūhasya viśvasyānekaadharmanah |
*sarvadā sarvathā bhāvāt kvacit kiñcid vivakṣyate || **

In Bhartṛhari's system *dik* (direction), *kāla* (time), *ākāśa* (space), *kriyā* (action), *abhyanuṣṭhā* (permission), *pratibandha* (suspension), *atīta* (past), *vartamāna* (present), *bhaviṣyat* (future), *samavāya* (inherence), *sādhana* (instrument) and similar other potencies of *śabda-brahman*, the Ultimate Word-Principle, have been recognised with a view to explaining the workings of the world of appearance in which we live and move and have our being.⁷ Of these potencies *Kāla-śakti*⁸ of *śabda*-

7. Cf. "Bhartṛhari has mentioned names of some of the main powers of the Brahman (neut.) : time, space, direction, action, inherent instrument, sequence, permission, suspension, decomposition, present, past, future, etc. All these powers can be divided into categories : (1) The direct powers of the Brahman (neut.) and (2) the indirect powers of Brahman (neut.). Time, space, direction, action, generally come under direct powers. Inherence, instrument, sequence, permission, suspension, decomposition, present, past, future, etc. come under indirect powers." - Sarveswara Sharma Peri : *The Idea of Power (Śakti) in the Vākyapadīya in Bhāratīya Vidyā*, Vol. XLI, pp. 75-79, Nos. 1-2.

8. The non-difference of *śakti* and *śaktimat* advanced by the teachers of the Pratyabhijñā School of Kashmir may be noted here. Compare :

śaktiś ca śaktimat-rūpād vyatirekaṃ na vāñchati |
tādātmyam anayor nityaṃ vahni-dāhikayor iva ||

- Abhinavagupta's *Bodha-pāñcāśikā* v. 3. In the Sixth Section of the Third *Kāṇḍa* of *Vākyapadīya* Bhartṛhari has elaborately discussed the issue of difference and non-difference or identity between *śakti* and *śaktimat* in the following *kārikā*-s, where it has been clearly laid down that the discussion is futile from the absolute standpoint. Cf. :

ekatvam āsām śaktinām nānātvaṃ veti kalpane |
avastu-patite jñātvā satyato na parāmṛset ||
.....
naikatvam asty anānātvaṃ vinaikatvena netarat ||
paramūrthe tayoṛ eṣa bhedo 'tyantaṃ na vidyate ||

(Continued on the next page)

brahman has been recognised as the basic power, the *primus inter pares*, which is also designated by the term *svātantrya* and is endowed with the capacities of *pratibandha* and *abhyanuṣṭhā*, through the operation of which the origin, duration and disappearance of objects in the world are controlled and determined. Bhartṛhari, in the *Kāla-samuddeśa* section of the *Vākyapadīya*, calls time (*kāla*) as the *sūtra-dhāra*, the operator and string-holder, of this universe conceived as a unique machine (*loka-yantra*), which is at the root of its creation and destruction :

tam asya loka-yantrasya sūtra-dhāraṃ pracakṣate |
pratibandhābhyanuṣṭhābhyāṃ tena viśvaṃ vibhajyate ||
yadi na pratibadhnīyat pratibandhaṃ ca notsrjet |
*avasthā vyatikīrṇyaṃ paurvāparyaavinākṛtāḥ ||**

The six-fold modes of action as conceived by Vārṣayāṇi - viz. *janman*, *sattā*, *vipariṇāma*, *vṛddhi*, *apakṣaya* and *vināśa*, are but evolutes and manifestations of this basic and independent *kāla-śakti* inherent in *śabda-brahman*.* Bhartṛhari has even equated *Kāla* with the all-pervading (*vibhu*) and omnipotent (*svatantra*) Brahman, which is *Śabda-tattva* Itself according to his metaphysical view-point, as is clear from the following *kārikā* of the *Kāla-samuddeśa* : (*VP. III. 9. 14*) :

jala-yantra-bhramāveśa-sadṛśibhiḥ pravṛttibhiḥ |
sa kalāḥ kālāyan sarvāḥ kālākkhyāṃ labhate vibhuḥ ||⁹

(Continued from the last page)

na śaktināṃ tathā bhede yathā śaktimatāṃ sthitiḥ |
na ca laukikam ekatvam tāsāṃ ātmasu vidyate ||

- *Vākyapadīya*, III. 6. 24-27.

Helārāja observes :

tathā śaktināṃ kārya-nānātvenonnīyamāna-bhedānāṃ
svata ādharāccābhede' stūtyanirvācyā eva bhedaḥ
sarvāḥ śaktayaḥ | ata evāvidyāśaktir brahmaṇe bhedaṃ
na vidhatta || yena dvaitūpattiḥ Prakīrṇa-prakāśa

on III. 6. 27.

See also *Vākyapadīya*, III. 7. 38-39.

9. Compare : *avyāhataḥ katā yasya kūlaśaktim upāśritāḥ |*
janmūdaye vikārāḥ śad bhūva-bhedasya yonayaḥ ||

- *Vākyapadīya*, I. 3.

But, even so, Bharṭṛhari looks upon the operation of *kāla-śakti* as valid only in the state of nescience (*avidyā*) which disappears when true realisation of the Ultimate Reality viz. *śabda-brahman*, shines forth in all its pristine glory. As he states :

śaktyātma-devatā-pakṣair bhinnam kālasya darśanam |
*prathamam tad avidyāyām yad vidyāyām na vidyate ||*¹⁰
 (VP. III. 9. 62)

Thus, the reality of the phenomenal world, brought into being through the operation of the *kāla-śakti* and other derivatives thereof, is only appearance from the view-point of the Absolute

10. Cf. : " According to Bharṭṛhari, time is a creative power. As long as *avidyā* continues, time and its powers – *pratibandha*, *abhyanuṣṭhā*, *krama*, *jarā*, *bhūta*, *bhaviṣyat*, *vartamāna*, etc. – all are real in the empirical world. They are not super-impositions. When true knowledge, i.e. *vidyā*, is attained, the entire universe is recognised as mere illusion and thus time, which is the first creation of illusion, disappears together with the entire universe (*kārikās* 62 and 67). " – Peri Sarveswara Sharma: *The Kāla-samuddēśa of Bharṭṛhari's Vākyapadīya*, Introduction, p. 32 (Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, First Edition, 1972). The following observations of Shri S. S. Peri may be noted in this connection: "...Bharṭṛhari repeatedly states that time controls the entire universe through its two powers 'suspension' and 'permission.' This is his novel conception. He exemplifies it, as we have seen, in *kārikās* 4-5, 15, 30, 42-44, and 70, and shows that the sequence we notice in the states of all things is also caused by the said two powers.

" Besides, time possesses three other energies – past, future, and present – through which things appear and disappear (see *kārikā* 44). But these three can, as a matter of fact, be reduced to two 'opening' (*unmīlana*) and 'closing' (*nimīlana*) – 'present' representing *unmīlana*, and 'past' as well as 'future' representing *nimīlana*. Again, *unmīlana* and *nimīlana* are nothing but *abhyanuṣṭhā* and *pratibandha*, respectively. " – *Op. cit.*, Intro., pp. 30-31.

It may be pointed out here in this connection that Abhinavagupta, the great philosopher of the Śaiva-Pratyabhijñā school of Kashmir, makes use of the expression *unmīlana-śakti* with reference to *pratibhā* in the concluding verse of his commentary *Locana* on the *First Uddyota* of the *Dhvanyūloka*, which reminds us of Bharṭṛhari's use of *unmīlana* with reference to *Kāla-śakti*. Cf. :

yad-unmīlana-śaktyaiva viśvam unmīlati kṣaṇāt |
svātmāyatana-viśrāntām tām vande pratibhām śivām ||

– viz. *śabdatattva*, which can be realised when the transcendental vision (*vidyā*) bursts forth driving away the veil of nescience that limits our capacity to dive into the very core of things.

VI

Now, there arises the question as regards the relation between *śabda-brahman* or Supreme Reality on the one hand and the phenomenal universe of *nāma-rūpa* on the other. It may be noted in this connection that Bhartṛhari in his *vṛtti* on *Vākyapadīya*, I. 12 :

prāptarūpa-vibhāgāyā yo vācaḥ paramo rasaḥ |
yat tat puṇyatamaṁ jyotiḥ tasya mārgo 'yam āñjasaḥ ||

cites a verse in corroboration of his doctrine of identity of *śabda* and *artha*, which runs as follows and in which the Vedāntic terminology — *nāman* and *rūpa* has been distinctly made use of :

nāmaivedaṁ rūpatvena vavṛte
rūpaṁ cedaṁ nāma-mātre 'vatasthe |
eke tad ekam avibhaktaṁ vibhejūḥ
prāg evānye bhedarūpaṁ vadanti ||

Just as in the Advaita Vedānta there is the fundamental problem relating to the relation between *Brahman* and the Universe and according to difference of viewpoints the doctrines of *utpatti-vāda*, *pariṇāma-vāda*, *vivarta-vāda* have been propounded, similarly the self-same view-points are possible in the context of the origin of the universe spread before us from *śabda-brahman*. Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, while refuting the doctrine of *śabdādvaita-vāda* ascribed to Bhartṛhari, examines its validity from the various standpoints of *śabdādhyāsa-vāda*, *śabda-pariṇāma-vāda*, and *śabda-vivarta-vāda*. Bhartṛhari in his *Vākyapadīya* employs the term *pariṇāma* as also *vivarta* (along with its cognate variants – viz. *vivartate*, *vivṛtta* etc.) that might give rise to ambiguity regarding his explanation of the relation subsisting between *śabda-brahman* and the manifested universe in the shape of audible words

(*nāman*) and the objects or meanings (*rūpa/artha*). For example, in the *Kārikā*, I. 120 – viz. :

śabdasya pariṇāmo 'yam ity āmnāyavido viduḥ |
chandobhya eva prathamam etad viśvaṁ vyavartata ||

– the terms *pariṇāma* and *vivarta* as implied in the expression *vyavartata* have been employed more or less indiscriminately.¹¹ So there is ample scope for clarification of the exact significance of these two terms, also traceable in the Vedāntic tradition, and perhaps, due to this ambiguity the opponents of the *śabdādvaita-vāda* like Jayanta Bhaṭṭa have endeavoured to demonstrate the non-validity of Bharṭṛhari's doctrine from the viewpoint both of *pariṇāma* and *vivarta* as used in their technical sense in the classical philosophical systems of Sāṃkhya and *Advaita-Vedānta*. The same problem as to the validity of *ārambha-vāda*, *pariṇāma-vāda* and *vivarta-vāda* with reference to causality in the context of the phenomenal world, for example in the case of production of a jar (*ghaṭa*) from a lump of clay (*mṛt-piṇḍa*), has to be faced and it has been resolved from different viewpoints by the upholders of *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika*, Sāṃkhya and *Advaita* metaphysics in consonance with their respective philosophical outlook.

11. Bharṭṛhari has used the term *vivartate* and its other cognates very frequently with a view to explaining the origin of the universe (*viśva*) in the form of *nāma-rūpa* from *śabda*. Cf. *Vākyapadīya*, I. 1, I. 112, 114 (*vyvartata*), I. 117 (*vivartamūna*), I. 146 (*vivṛttānām*), etc. The following remarks of Allen Wright Thrasher of Chicago in his article entitled *Vivarta According to Maṇḍana Miśra* in *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Archiv für Indische Philosophie*, Band XXV, 1981 would be deemed pertinent on this issue :

"To the objection that VPy usually seems to identify *vivarta* and *pariṇāma*, the reply may be given that it is not stating its own opinion here but giving that of others. Besides, the VPy in at least one other place appears to deny modification of Brahman. Commenting on V. P. I. 1, it quotes this verse (14.1–2) : *tathedaṁ amṛtaṁ brahma... || ...vikāra* is used instead of its synonym *pariṇāma*. It appears that it is distinguished from *vivarta*, even though elsewhere it is used where we would expect *vivarta*. But it is hard to pin the author of the VPy down. As M. Biardeau justly says, he continually shows a "synchrétisme invertébré," – *loc. cit.*, p. 229,

The problem of production of the effect from the cause has been explained by Śaṅkara and his followers as *vivarta*, an illusory appearance without any objective reality, where the cause appears as effect, the effect being just a super-imposition (*adhyāsa*), having no objectivity of its own apart from the cause which alone is real. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika doctrine of *ārambha-vāda* and the Sāṃkhya theory of *pariṇāma-vāda* are but stepping stones leading gradually to the doctrine of *vivarta-vāda* of the Advaitins, which is the only true and satisfactory explanation of the problem of causality. This also seems to be the standpoint of Bhartṛhari, who being a Monist, cannot afford to admit the objective reality of the phenomenal creation independently of *śabda-tattva*, which alone is real in his system. It has also to be noted that Bhartṛhari like the Advaitins of Śaṅkara's system frequently makes use of the imageries of *alāta-cakra*,¹²

12. For *alāta-cakra* see *Vākyapadīya*, III. 8. 8, II. 291. The question of production of effect from the cause, e. g. in *bijād ankuro jāyate*, has been looked upon from the viewpoints of *ārambha*, *pariṇāma* and *vivarta* in *Vākyapadīya*, III. 7. 105-107, where Bhartṛhari refers to his own theory of identity of the effect with its cause, as interpreted by Helārāja. Cf.

yuktam caitad yad uta kārṇam eva kōrya-bhāvenāvatīṣhata iti
svasiddhāntam upapādayitum āha - yathāheḥ kuṇḍalībhaṭṭavo vyagrā-
nām ca samagrātū | tathāiva janmarūpatvaṁ satām ekam
pracakṣate ||

- Helārāja's *Prakīrṇa-prakāśa* on *Vākyapadīya*, III. 7. 107. Helārāja points out unambiguously that the term *vikāra* in the expression *bhāva-vikāra* stands for *vivarta* and not *pariṇāma* in his commentary on *Vākyapadīya*, III. 1. 36 :

sarvabhāva-vikāreṣu saḍavasthūḥ prapadyate | krameṇa śaktibhiḥ
svābhinavam pratyavabhāṣate || - in the following extract :
....na ca parināti-darśanābhiprāyeṇāyam vikāra-śabdaḥ | anitya-
ta-prasaṅgāt | aḥi tu vivarta-paryāyo'yaṁ | tathā hi - sarva-
śaktiyūtna-bhūtatvād brahmaṇo'neka-vikāra-pradarśana-sāmarthyā-
lakṣaṇā avidyūtmā śaktiḥ kōrya-bhedād upacaritanāntvā samasti-
tyūgamavidāḥ | itthaṁ ca svābhir eva śaktibhir avyatiriktābhir
janmādirūpatayā avidyāyām ūbhāṣate | tad eva sarvabhāveṣu
samūna-rūpaṁ sattātmakam anyasya tad-vyatiriktasyābhāvād
ity eṣo 'trārthaḥ |

Similarly, in his commentary on *Vākyapadīya*, III. 2. 15 : viz. *vikārāpa-game satyam*.... etc. Helārāja clearly states :

(Continued on next page)

gandharva-nagara, *maru-marīcikā*, *svapna-gaja*, *raju-sarpa*, *śukti-rajata* etc. to illustrate the unreality of the phenomenal creation. Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, in his *Nyāya-mañjarī*, has examined the concept of *vivarta* from the standpoints of *ārambha*, *pari-ṇāma* and *avabhāsa* and has tried to bring out its utter improbability as an argument towards establishing the soundness of the doctrine of *śabda-tattva* as the sole reality.

VII

Now, according to Śaṅkara's *Advaita* every phenomenal entity, though false as an appearance, has yet a core of reality, hidden under its outward sheath, which consists of *nāma-rūpa*. As it has been stated in Vidyāraṇya's *Pañcadaśī* :

asti bhāti priyaṃ rūpaṃ nāma cety aṃśa-pañcakam |
ādyam trayam brahma-rūpaṃ jagad-rūpaṃ ato dvayam ||

Thus, existence (*sattā*), illumination, which is but another name of consciousness (*caitanya*) and bliss (*ānanda*) are inherent and innermost constituents of every entity in the phenomenal universe, whereas name (*nāma*) and form (*rūpa*) are but outward appearances only. The first three constitute the essential nature of *brahman* and as such real (*satya*), whereas the remaining two are variable and illusory, and as such false (*mithyā* or *anṛta*). Every phenomenal being is thus made up of these two parts – the one true and real, and the other false and unreal. As Śaṅkara declares in his *Śārīraka-Bhāṣya* :

satyānṛte mithunīkṛtya naisargiko'yaṃ loka-vyavahāraḥ |

(Continued from previous page)

tasya cid-rūpasya cicchaktir aperiṇāminīti vikārābhāvāt nedaṃ
Sāṃkhya-nayavat pariṇāma-darśanam, api tu vivarta-pakṣaḥ |
viśeṣaś cānayaṃ Vākyapadīye'smābhikṛt vyākhyāta iti tata evāvadhā-
ryam | ihāpi Sambandha-samuddeśe vakṣyate | kṛāṇāntara-
vyudāsaś cādvaya-siddhāv abhihita iti saty arthitve taṭa
evavūgantavyaḥ |

Bhartṛhari's approach on this issue is also essentially the same. For he also looks upon phenomenal creation as made up of two aspects – one real and the other unreal. The essence of the real aspect is pure Being (*sattā*), which is manifested as *jāti* (Universal) in all particulars (*vyakti*). It is *jāti* in the form of *sattā* that is the noumenon, while the *vyakti*-s are mere appearances, having varying names and forms. That *sattā* is inherent in the connotation of every *prātipadika* and every *dhātu* and it is the great *Ātman* or Self that permeates the entire universe. As Bhartṛhari declares in the First Section (*Jāti-samudeśa*) of the *Prakīrṇa-kāṇḍa* of his *Vākyapadīya* (III. 1. 32–34) :

satyāsatyau tu yau bhāgau pratibhāvaṃ vyavasthitau |
satyaṃ yat tatra sā jātir asatyā vyaktayaḥ smṛtāḥ ||
sambandhibhedāt sattaiva bhidyamānā gavādiṣu |
jātir ity ucyate tasyāṃ sarve śabdā vyavasthitāḥ |
tāṃ prātipadikārthaṃ ca dhātvarthaṃ ca pracakṣate |
*sā nityā sā mahān ātmā tāṃ ākṣu tva-talādayaḥ ||*¹³

As in Bhartṛhari's system meanings (*artha*) are nothing but evolutes of *śabda-brahman*, which is but another name of *Sphoṭa*, and as *Sphoṭa* is both pure Being and pure Consciousness, it is but quite natural that the meanings, too, would partake of these attributes of the Ultimate Reality. Bhartṛhari says that of the three illuminations (*jyotiḥ/prakāśa*) – viz. *jñāna*, *śabda* and *dīpa*, which illumine their own selves as also others appearing to be

13. Cf. *satyaṃ vastu tadākūrain asatyair avadhāryate |*
asatyopādhibhūḥ śabdaiḥ satyaṃ evābhidhīyate ||

Vākyapadīya, III. 2. 2.

In this connection reference might be made to Helārāja's comments on *Vākyapadīya*, III. 8. 35. (*Kṛtyā-samuddēśa* : *sattā sva-śakti-yogena sarva-rūpā vyavasthitā | sādhyā ca sādhanam caiva phalaṃ bhoktā phalasya ca ||*) — *sarvatra bhoktrādiṣu samūtrasya samvidrūpasyānugamūt tasyaiva satyatā | vikalpa-parighaṭitas tu nānā-vyavahāraḥ iti sarvādvaita-vādiṣu samānam etat |*

distinct from them simultaneously,¹⁴ it is *śabda* that is the holiest and sublimest (*puṇyatama*), because it lies at the basis of illumination of the other two – viz. *jñāna* and *dīpa* – as well. Thus, it is but quite rational according to Bhartṛhari that *śabda-brahma* is both pure Being (*sattā*) and pure Consciousness (*caitanya*) inalienably intertwined, and this nature breaks through every verbal element as also its objective counterpart in the phenomenal universe. Not only that. *Śabda-brahman* is also *rasa* – i. e. Bliss (*ānanda*). Bhartṛhari calls the speech of the learned, and *ipso facto* the Ultimate Reality (*śabda-brahma* / *sphoṭa*) revealed through it, as *paramo rasaḥ*, the rest being but *ṛjīṣa*.¹⁵ In one of the verses quoted in Harivṛṣabha's gloss on *Vākyapadīya*, I. 142 from a source referred to as *Itihāsa*, we read :

gaur iva prakṣaraty ekā rasam uttama-śālinī |
*divyādivyena rūpeṇa bhāratī gauḥ śuci-smitā ||*¹⁶

This recalls to our mind the famous Upaniṣadic saying :

raso vai saḥ | rasam hyevāyam labdhvā'nandī bhavati ||

So, *śabda-brahman*, which is pure Being and pure Consciousness is also at the same time pure Bliss (*ānanda-rasa*). Thus, the parallelism between the metaphysical view as propounded by Bhartṛhari in his system in respect of the nature of *śabda-brahman*, or the Ultimate Reality, which shines forth through the phenomenal universe evolving as *vācya* and *vācaka*, along two

14. Compare : *iha trīṇi jyotiṃṣi trayāḥ prakāśāḥ svarūpa-pararūpayor avadyotakūḥ | tad yathā – yo'yaṃ jātavedāḥ yaś ca puruṣeṣv āntaraḥ prakāśo yaś ca prakāśāḥ prakāśayoḥ prakāśayitū śabdākhyāḥ prakāśas tatrātat sarvam upanibaddham yūvat sthānu carīṣṇu ca |* — Harivṛṣabha's *vṛtti* on *Vākyapadīya* I, 12.

15. Cf. *paramo rasa . . iti | vācakatvād abhyudaya-hetutvāc ca vyavasthita-sādhubhūtaḥ śabda-samūho'bhīdhīyate | evam hy āha — ṛjīṣam etad vāco yaḥ saṃskārahīnaḥ śabdaḥ* — Harivṛṣabha's *vṛtti* on *Vākyapadīya*, I, 12.

16. This reminds one of the verse attributed to Bhaṭṭanāyaka and cited by Abhinavagupta in his *Locana* on *Dhvanyāloka*, I. :

vāgdhenuṣṭha dugdha etam hi rasam yad bala-trṣṇayā |
tena nūsa samāḥ sa syād duhyate yogibhir hi yaḥ ||

apparently distinct streams on the one hand and the Upaniṣadic conception of *Brahman* as *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda* manifesting Itself both as *nāman* and *rūpa* on the other is strikingly complete. It might be pointed out in this connection that Helārāja in his commentary on *Sādhana-samuddeśa* remarks *inter alia* that the great Patañjali was also an upholder of Monism (*advaita-naya*) as is evident from his observations concerning the validity of such usages as ' *Kūlaṃ pipatiṣati*.'¹⁷ Everything is the manifestation of *Brahman* — be it *vācaka* (Word) or *vācya* (Meaning), which are but other names of *nāman* and *rūpa* respectively. Koṇḍa Bhaṭṭa, while commenting on the *Vaiyākaraṇa-Bhūṣaṇa-Kārikā* 71 Viz. *satyāsatyau tu yau bhāgau*...., which is from Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya*, clearly states :

*nityaṃ dravyaṃ — iti pratīkaṃ ādāya asatyopādhyava-
cchinnaṃ brahma-tattvaṃ dravya-śabda-vācyaṃ ity
arthaḥ | brahma-rāsir — ity ādāya brahma-tattvaṃ eva
śabdasvarūpatayā bhātīti Kaiyate spaṣṭam |*¹⁸ *evam
vācyaṃ vācakaṃ ca brahmaiveti bhāvah ||*

The same theme is re-echoed in his *Vaiyākaraṇa-Bhūṣaṇa-Sāra* under verse 71. The analytic methods adopted by the Grammarians are but mere fictions of imagination pointing in the direction of *śabda-brahman*, the Ultimate Reality, just as in the

17. Cf. *advaita-naye hi sarvaṃ upāplavate asatyatvād — iti vikalpa-
parighaṭṭaḥ śābdo vyavahārah pratīty-avicārita siddho 'bhyupagantav-
yah — iti digādi-padārthavat sādhanā-padārtha-siddhiḥ | darśitam — iti
advaita-nayūvalambibhiḥ Bhāṣyakūra-prabhṛtibhiḥ | kūlaṃ pipatiṣati —
ityādi-prayogasiddhyartham ākhyātam ity arthaḥ |*—Helārāja on *Vākyapadīya*
III. 7. 8 : *svatantra-ṣaṭatantratva-kramarūpaṃ ca darśitam | nirīheṣu api
bhāveṣu kalpanoṣanibandhanam ||*

18. Reference, here, is to *Mahābhāṣya* text under P. I. 1. 2. on the *Vārttika* — *varṇa jñānaṃ vāg-viśayo yatra ca brahma vartate — viz. :
so'yaṃ akṣara-samāmnāyo vāk-samāmnāyah puṣpitaḥ phalitaś candra-tāra-
kavat pratimaṇḍito veditavyo brahma-rāsir |*

Compare : " To the spiritual insight of Patañjali *Varṇas* were not only phonetic types but glowing sparks of Brahman illumining the entire sphere of existence." — Dr. P. C. Chakravarti : *Spiritual Outlook of Sanskrit Grammar* in *Journal of the Department of Letters*, Vol. XXV (1934), p. 2.

Taittirīya Upaniṣad, *Bṛgu-vallī* and *Ananda-vallī*, the five sheaths (*pañca-kōśa*) have been conceived as but stepping stones to the realisation of our Inmost Being, which is the substratum of all phenomenal appearances :

*pañca-kōśādivat tasmāt kalpanaiṣā samāśritā |
upeya-pratipattiyarthā upāyā avyavasthitāḥ ||*

In explaining the *kārikā* Koṇḍa Bhaṭṭa observes :

*evaṃ ca yathā pañca kōśā api sarvādhāra-brahma-
bodhanāyaivoktā na tu vāstavam eṣāṃ brahmatvaṃ
tathaiiva prakṛti-pratyāḍibhir vicāro'py-akhaṇḍa-sphoṭa-
bodhanopāya iti bhāvaḥ ||*¹⁹

Thus, in the concluding *kārikā* of the *Sphoṭa-nirṇaya* section of the *Vaiyākaraṇa-Bhūṣaṇa* (72), Bhaṭṭoji pays his obeisance to *Brahman*, which is *śabda-tattva*, which is *nirañjana*, *akṣara* and *pūrṇātman*, just like *Brahman* as taught in the *Upaniṣads* :

*ittham niṣkṛṣya-māṇaṃ yac-chabdatattvaṃ nirañjanam |
brahmaivety akṣaram prāhus tasmai pūrṇātmane namaḥ ||*

- on which Koṇḍa Bhaṭṭa comments as follows :

*nāma-rūpe vyākaraṇāṇi -iti śruti-prasiddhā dvayī sṛṣṭiḥ |
tatra rūpasyeva nāmno'pi tad eva tattvaṃ |
janma-maraṇādikam tadvat-prapañcas ca tatṛavidyākalpita
iti vedānta-tattvaṃ asmākam apīṣṭam eva |
uktam hi Vākyapadīye - ajanmani tathā nitye paurvā-
parya-vivarjite |
tattve janmādi-rūpatvaṃ viruddham upalabhyate || -iti
tasmād avidyā-daśāyām uktarītyā jātir eva sphoṭaḥ |
niṣkarṣe tu brahmaiva sphoṭa iti bhāvaḥ ||*²⁰

19. For the Absolute as distinct from *ānandamaya-kōśa* even see Saṅkara's *Viveka-cūḍāmaṇi*, (p. 214), where *Brahman* is referred to as *pañcakōśa-vilakṣaṇa*.

20. On the *kārikā* '*ajanmani tathā nitye*' — (*Vākyapadīya*, III. 2, 18) Helārāja observes : *viruddham upalabhyate — iti vadanm avidyāyām viro-*

(Continued on the next page)

VIII

At this stage the query might reasonably arise: If the *śabda-tattva* conceived as *brahman* in the grammatico-metaphysical system of Bhartṛhari be so closely akin to the Upaniṣadic conception of Brahman as Being, Consciousness and Bliss, what can be the *raison d'être* of posing a new metaphysical doctrine which ultimately reduces itself to Vedāntic Monism? How is *śabda-brahman* to be differentiated from *brahman* of the Upaniṣads? This, indeed, is a very cogent query and it must have to be faced and answered satisfactorily before the doctrine of *śabda-brahman* can be regarded as a novel and valid contribution in the field of philosophical inquiry. Bhartṛhari's arguments in favour of considering *śabda* as the ubiquitous and eternal principle underlying all our activities within the limits of the phenomenal universe and as the sole ground of its diversities and differentiations are mainly that all our cognitions of objects are imbued with the corresponding verbal counterparts and that the identity of *śabda* with *artha* on the one hand and the corresponding cognition on the other is firmly established by such usages as *gaur iti jñānam*, *gaur iti śabdaḥ*, and *gaur ity arthaḥ*, where we identify the verbal concept with *jñāna*, *śabda* and *artha*. Even the cognitions of a child, an uneducated rustic and birds and beasts are shot through with *śabda*, though not as distinct as in the case of grown up men acquainted with the use of language as the medium of communication. In Bhartṛhari's view in the case of new-born baby or an animal of lower species *śabda-bhāvanā*,²¹

(Continued from the last page)

*dham abhyupaiti | etad eva hy avidyāyūḥ svarūpaṃ yad anupaḥpadyamānam
apy ābhāsopagamaṃ nayati upaḥpānatve vidyāiva syūt | tasmād asatya-
prapañca-prakāśana-śaktir brahmaṇo'nādi-siddhā grāhya-grāhaka-yugalam
svānūrūpaṃ uparacayya jagan-nātyam ātanotī tyavicūrīta-ramaṇīyābhimā-
nam apanayanti tattva-dṛśaḥ |*

21. The expression *śabda-bhāvanā* occurs in *Vākya-padīya*, I. 122:
*ūdayaḥ karaṇa-vinyāsaḥ prāṇasyordhvaṃ samīraṇam |
sthānānām abhigṛhāṣaś ca na vinā śabda-bhāvanām ||*

This *śabda-bhāvanā* is 'beginningless', is 'beyond the scope of human
(Continued on the next page)

the subtle impressions of *śabda* are stored in the inner psychosis as seeds which make all activities possible. As he says :

itikartavyatā loke sarvā śabda-vyapāśrayā |
yām pūrvāhita-saṃskāro bālo'pi pratipadyate //

Abhinavagupta, in his gloss on Bharata's *Nāṭya-śāstra*, XX. 26 :
yā vāk-pradhānā...sā Bhāratī, observes :

na hy eko'pi kaścic ceṣṭānśo'sti | kāya-ceṣṭā api hi
mānasībhiḥ sūkṣmābhiḥ ca vācīkībhiḥ ceṣṭābhir
vyāpyanta eva | na so'sti pratyayo loke yaḥ śabdānu-
*gamād ṛte' iti nyāyāt //*²²

Śabda as conceived in Bharṭṛhari's system is the very consciousness (*saṃjñā/pratibhā*) itself :

*saiśā saṃsāriṇām saṃjñā bahir antaś ca vartate |**

If this universal and all-pervasive potency (*śakti*) residing in *vāk* disappears, there would be no illumination (*prakāśa*) anywhere and life would be reduced to an inorganic mass devoid of the least tinge of consciousness in it. In the words of Bharṭṛhari :

arthakriyāsu vāk sarvān saṃīhayati dehinaḥ |
tad-utkrāntau viśaṃjño 'yaṃ dr̥śyate kāṣṭha-kudṛyavat //

(Continued from the last page)

effort' and is embodied in the mind of every individual in the form of a subtle seed in which all knowledge is dormant. As it has been explained in the *vṛtti* : *anūdiś caīṣū śabda-bhūvanā prati-puruṣam svasthita-jñāna-bīja-parigrahā | na hy etasyūḥ katham api pauruṣeyatvam sambhavati |* This *śabda-bhūvanā* is again identified with *Pratibhā* as it has been observed in the *vṛtti* : *tathā hy-anupadeśa-sādhyūḥ pratibhā-gamyā eva karaṇa-vinyāsūdayaḥ |* Dr. Iyer notes : " *Pratibhā* seems to be another name for *śabda bhūvanā*. It stands (1) for the residual traces of the exercise of the faculty of speech in the previous birth; (2) for the faculty of speech with which the child is born; (3) for the child's instinct to do something in response to a situation." — *loc. cit.* It may be noted in this connection that Vācaspati Miśra has quoted and explained this *kārikā* of Bharṭṛhari in his *Nyāya-Kaṇikā*.

22. *Vākyapāḍīya of Śrī Bharṭṛhari* | Ed. Prof. K. V. Abhyankar and Acarya V. P. Limaye, Appendix III, p. 209.

But these lofty claims of Bhartṛhari regarding the role of Speech (*Vāk*) in the universe have been vehemently refuted by Jayanta Bhaṭṭa in his *Nyāya-Mañjarī*, as also by Kumārila in his *Śloka-vārtika*. Kumārila disowns Bhartṛhari's claim that the identity of *śabda* with *artha* and *jñāna* is clearly comprehended by us. In order to bring out the intrinsic difference underlying the nature of three elements Kumārila asserts :

gavi sāsṇādimad-rūpā gādi-rūpā'bhidhāyake |
*nirākārobhaya-jñāne saṃvittiḥ paramārthataḥ ||**

— *Śloka-vārtika* 185 on *Pratyakṣasūtra*

Śabda, according to the Mīmāṃsists, is just a means like the lamp or the organ of sight towards comprehension of an object as qualified by a particular property and the means (*upāya*) cannot be identified with the end (*upeya*). As Kumārila declares :

na copeye 'bhyupāyasya rūpādhyāsaḥ prasajyate |
*na hi dīpendriyādīnāṃ rūpādhyāropa iṣyate ||**

So, in his opinion, the comprehension of identity between *śabda*, *artha* and *jñāna*, which forms the bed-rock of Bhartṛhari's metaphysics, is nothing but a chimera.

The Naiyāyikas are too no less severe in their attack against Bhartṛhari's metaphysical concept of *Vāk*. The conception of three levels of *vāk* – viz. *Vaikharī*, *Madhyamā* and *Paśyantī*, is, according to Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, nothing but a fiction. *Madhyamā* is nothing but inner consciousness comprising both *vācya* (meaning) and *vācaka* (verbal element) as its objects without shedding in the least its intrinsic nature *quā* consciousness as distinct from its objects. *Paśyantī*, on the other hand, is but another name of indeterminate cognition (*nirvikalpaka-jñāna*), and though it is illuminatory in character, it is unwarranted to conceive it as identical with *vāk*, as Bhartṛhari and his followers do. Cognition alienated from the element of *vāk* is as much possible and valid as when associated with *vāk*, and it is not at all rational to think of cognition dissociated from *vāk* as inert and bereft of the potency of illumination as the *Śabdādvaita*.

vādins erroneously think. Thus, the thesis relating to the determinate character of all cognitions invariably associated as they are with the corresponding verbal element, as the *śabdādvaita-vādins* endeavour to establish, has no sound basis to stand upon. Jayanta Bhaṭṭa has thus summed up the position of the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* pluralists in the following verses :

*antaḥ-saṃkalpo varṇyate madhyamā vāk
seyam buddhyātmā naiṣa vācaḥ prabhedah |
buddhir vācyaṃ vācakaṃ collikhanti
rūpaṃ nātmīyaṃ bodha-bhāvaṃ jahāti ||
paśyuntiti tu nirvikalpakamater nāmāntaram kalpitam
vijñānasya hi na prakāśavapuṣo vāgrūpatā śāśvatī |
jāte 'smin viśayāvabhāsinī tataḥ syād vā'vamarśo giro
na syād vāpi na jātu vāg-virahite bodho jaḍatvaṃ
spṛśet ||²³*

In short *Vaikhari* is the only form of speech that is conceivable and Bhartrhari's metaphysical super-structure falls to the ground with the demolition of the three levels of speech, which form its corner-stone. As Jayanta Bhaṭṭa notes :

*yat punar avādi vācas traividhyaṃ tad api nānumanyante |
ekaiva vaikhari vāg vāg - iti prasiddhā hi ||²⁴*

In connection with his refutation of *śabda-vivarta-vāda* Jnyanta observes that if *śabda-brahman* be endowed with its innate properties of consciousness, being, bliss and ubiquity in consonance with the Upaniṣadic utterance - viz. "*vijñānam ānandam brahma*," it becomes nothing but a novel nomenclature for Supreme Godhead (*Īśvara*) as conceived by the Naiyāyikas. As Jayanta states :

*atha ' vijñānam ānandam brahma ' ity āgama-vacanam
anusratā vibhūtvam iva cetanatvam api śabda-*

23. *Nyāya-mañjarī*, Vol. I, p. 355 (Kashi Sanskrit Series Edn.)

24. *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 355.

*brahmaṇo varṇyate tarhīśvarasyaiva śabda-brahmeti
nāma kṛtaṃ syāt //**

Besides, the existence of two *brahma*-s – viz. one *śabda-brahman* and the other *para-brahman*, as pointed out in the oft-quoted verse :

*dve brahmaṇi veditavye śabda-brahma paraṃ ca yat |
śabda-brahmaṇi niṣṇātaḥ param brahmādhigacchati //*²⁵

– has been sarcastically derided by Jayanta with the remark that it is, indeed, an abnormal phenomenon, which can be called *brahma-subhikṣa*, where *brahman* can be accessible according to our own sweet will irrespective of numbers, and if one of these two *brahma*-s be fictitious, it is indeed not proper to designate it as *brahman*, whereas if both of them be equally real the Monism of the Grammarians becomes untenable. So, Jayanta concludes his critique of *śabdādvaita-vāda* with the following cryptic joke :

*yad apy ucyate 'dve brahmaṇi veditavye...' iti
tad api brahma-subhikṣam atyantam alaukikam
ekatarasya brahmaṇaḥ kālpanikatvāt | akālpanikatve
vā katham advaita-vādaḥ? tasmāt kṛtaṃ etena śabda-
brahmaṇā | svasti parasmai brahmaṇe bhūyāt... //*²⁶

The Vedantists of Śāṅkara's school are equally stringent in their attack on *śabdādvaita-vāda* of the Grammarians. In Vimuktātman's *Iṣṭa-siddhi* this monistic doctrine has been refuted point by point in the first chapter, *kārikās* 73–76 and the gloss thereon. The main grounds of his attack are as follows :

25. *Triṣṭupura-tāpinyuṇiṣad*, 5. 17 with the variant *hi mantavye* for *veditavye*.

26. *Nyāya-mañjarī*, Vol. II, p. 103. In the *Sarva-darśana-saṃgraha* (Section on *Pāṇini-Darśana*, XIII, 274–284) the hemistich *śabda-brahmaṇi niṣṇātaḥ* – is attributed to *abhiyukta*, who is Vyāsa. See *Mahā-bhārata*, 12. 224, 10; also, 12. 262. 1 (Critical Edition, Poona).

(1) the same *śabda* cannot be both *vācya* and *vaktṛ*. As he notes :

*āha śabdaḥ svayaṁ vācya iti śabdo na tat tathā |
aikye hi vaktṛtā vā syād vācyaṭā vā na tūbhayaṁ ||**

(2) The doctrine that both *vācya* and *vācaka* are but *vivarta*-s of *śabda-brahman* and have, therefore, been identified with *brahman* goes against the express declaration of the Upaniṣads that *brahman* is a-*śabda*, other than *śabda*, in such statements as : *aśabdam asparśam arūpam avyayam*... . Besides, if *śabda* be conceived as *buddhi-grāhya* in its subtle form, it cannot be regarded as *svayam-prakāśa*. On the other hand, if it is regarded as *svayam-prakāśa*, it reduces itself to nothing but Upaniṣadic Self, which by no means can be identified with *śabda*. As Vimuktātman observes in his comments on *Iṣṭa-siddhi*, I. 75 :

*na ca śabdo brahmeti śrutir asti | yadi nāmāsti tathāpi
sā anya-parā | na tu śabdasya brahmatvam brahmaṇo
vā śabdatvaṁ vadet |... 'yad vācā'nabhyuditaṁ yena
vāg abhyudyate', 'yac chrotreṇa na śṛṇoti', aśabdam
asparśam – ityāder na śabdo brahma nāpi śabdavad iti
śrutam | ataḥ śabdo brahmety ayuktam |... ato na
śabdādvaita-siddhiḥ |*

(3) What more, if *śabda* is regarded as *brahman*, *brahman* is apparently reduced to something that is external (*parāk*) and not the innermost principle (*pratyak*) like our conscious Self (*ātman*). So it is more logical to subscribe to the monistic view of *ātmādvaita* and repudiate the doctrine of *śabdādvaita* as propounded by the Grammarians, which is as much valid as *ghaṭādvaita*, as has been scathingly put forth by Vimuktātman :

*śabdo brahmety ukte parāgeva brahma uktam ajñō man-
yate na tu pratyak | ātmaśabdenānukatatvāc ca | ato
'haṁ brahmeti dhīr na bhavet, anātmā brahmeti vā dhīr
bhavet | tadā 'ahaṁ brahmāsmi' tyādi-śruti-virodhaḥ |
...tasmād ātmādvaitam eva sidhyati, na śabdādvaitam
ghaṭādvaitam veti siddham ||* (Iṣṭa-siddhi, p. 176)*

IX

Thus, Bhartṛhari's doctrine, which is based upon *āgama*²⁷ or unbroken tradition, as he himself claims, is unique in the history of metaphysical speculations of India. It is not merely based on *tarka* or discursive reasoning, but has its firm roots in the mystic spiritual experiences of the great seers of old, which in their turn are based upon *āgama*-s. As Bhartṛhari boldly declares :

na cāgamad ṛte dharmaś tarkeṇa vyuvatiṣṭhate |
ṛṣiṇām api yaj jñānam tad apy āgamapūrvakam ||
 (VP. I. 30)

Bhartṛhari likens *āgama* to *caitanya* or consciousness, which is ever-existent in an unbroken continuity. As he states :

caitanyam iva yaś cāyam avicchēdēna vartate |
āgamas tam upāsīno hetuvādair na bādhyate ||
 (VP. I. 41)

So, the wisdom that is stored in the *āgama*-s and re-inforced by the direct perceptual realisations of the distinguished seers affiliated to the respective *āgama*-s cannot be invalidated by *tarka* or *hetuvāda* or argumentative reasonings running counter to those *āgama*-s. And of all the *āgama*-s Bhartṛhari regards *trayī* alone as the seed which persists for ever even when all the rival *āgamas* disappear without leaving any trace behind. As he says :

na jātv akartṛkaṃ kaścid āgamam pratipadyate |
*bijaṃ sarvāgamāpāye trayī evāto vyavasthitā ||**
 (VP. I. 133)

Thus, Bhartṛhari's doctrine has its basis in *āgama*, has been re-inforced by the direct personal experiences of seers in their state of spiritual trance, and lastly, has been established as valid by reasoning (*tarka*) as well, which does not run counter to the wisdom embodied in the *āgama*-s, since *tarka* which does not go

27. For the different senses in which the word *āgama* has been used by Bhartṛhari Dr. Iyer's note I on *Vūkyapadīya*, I. 132 may be consulted,

against the Vedas and *śāstra*-s, that constitute the *āgama*, is like eyes illuminating the true essence of things to those who are devoid of their own power of discrimination. In the words of Bhartrhari: *veda-śāstrāvirodhī ca tarkaś cakṣur apaśyatām*.²⁸ Bhartrhari in the concluding verses of the second *Kāṇḍa* of his *magnum opus* sings in praise of the ancient *āgama*-s (*purāṇa-āgama*) and calls his treatise as *Āgama-samuccaya*, a systematizations of the traditional teachings relating to *Vyākaraṇāgama* undertaken under the inspiration of his preceptor.²⁹

According to Bhartrhari and the metaphysical school to which he is affiliated *Vyākaraṇāgama* is not merely concerned with an analytical study of the correct form of speech as spoken by the learned (*śiṣṭa*-s), it is also the gateway to the ultimate goal of human existence, the *summum bonum* of our life – viz. salvation (*apavarga*). As he declares in one of the memorable verses of *Brahma-kāṇḍa* :

tad dvāram apavargasya vāṇi-malānām cikitsitam /
*pavitram sarva-vidyānām adhividyam prakāśate ||*30*
(VP. I. 14)

28. Bhartrhari has dwelt upon the relation between *āgama* and *tarka* on numerous occasions in his *Vākyapadīya*. For *āgama* see, *Vākyapadīya* — I, 27, 30, 130, III, 2, 7. (unbroken tradition); (2) I. 41, etc., III, 2, 7, III, 3, 11, III, 8, 24, III, 11, 9 etc. (Rule of conduct observed by an unbroken traditional practice); (3) I. 141 (Scriptural work laying down unbroken tradition). Similarly, for *tarka* consult *Vākyapadīya*, I. 30, 48, 136, 138 (Method of drawing conclusions from inference, analogy and the like which is admissible, provided it does not go against scriptural and sacred literature which is accepted as an established truth). Vide Abhyankar and Limaye, *op. cit.*, Appendix V. In this connection Prof. K. Satchidananda Murty's *Revelation and Reason in Advaita Vedānta* might be consulted with profit.

29. Vide *Vākyapadīya*, II. 482–487. That the Science of Grammar too was a distinct *āgama* has been clearly stated in II. 482: *yaḥ Patañjali-śiṣyebhyo bhraṣṭo vyākaraṇāgamaḥ*; so also *tad vyākaraṇam āgamya param brahmūdhigamyate* (I. 22). It has also been referred to as *Vyākaraṇa-smṛtiḥ*: *sādhutvajñāna-viśayā saīṣā vyākaraṇa-smṛtiḥ* (I. 142).

30. These two are as it were the 'flower' (*puṣpa*) and 'fruit' (*phala*) of the knowledge of *śabda-vidyā* or the Science of Grammar.

(Continued on next page)

“ It (Grammar) is the door to salvation, the remedy for all the impurities of speech, the purifier of all the sciences and shines in every branch of knowledge ”.*

Again :

*idam ādyaṃ pada-sthānaṃ siddhisopāna-parvaṇām |
iṃyaṃ sā mokṣamāṇānam ajihmā rāja-paddhatiḥ ||**

(VP. I. 16)

(Continued from the last page)

These two stages are hinted at in *Vākyaṭi*, I. 131 :

*tasmād yaḥ śabda-saṃskāraḥ sū siddhiḥ paramātmanah |
tasya pravṛtti-tattvajñas tad Brahmāmṛtam āśnute ||*

— and Harivṛṣabha's commentary thereon. Compare : “ The knowledge and correct use of words enables one to achieve happiness or spiritual merit in this life and in heaven... That is the first goal or ‘flower’ (*puṣpita*) the study of grammar can bring. The second goal significantly called the ‘fruit’ (*phalita*), includes the first but goes well beyond—it is the realisation of *mokṣa*, or complete union with *śabda-brahman*. In reaching *mokṣa* the knowledge and correct use of words is but the first step on the path. What are the subsequent steps? Here the *Vākyaṭi* becomes vague, although some clues are offered.” — Harold G. Coward ; *Bhartrhari*, p. 50. The imagery of *puṣpa* and *phala* is found to be employed not infrequently in connection with the discussion of words and their meanings by such great teachers as Yāska, Patañjali and Kumārila. For example, in *Nirukta*, I, 20 Yāska states : *arihaṃ vācaḥ puṣpa-phalam āha | yājña-daivate puṣpa-phale | devatā-dhyātme vā* — while explaining the *ṛk RV. X. 71. 5* : *adhenvā carati mūyayaiṣū | vācam śuśruvā aphalām apuṣpam ||*. Patañjali, while commenting on the *Vārttika* : *varṇajñānam vāg-viśayo yatra ca brahma vartate* observes : so ‘yam akṣara-samāmnāyo vāk-samāmnāyah puṣpitah phalitaś candra-tārakavat pratimaṇḍito veditavyo brahma-rāsiḥ | — *Paspaśū-Āhnika*. Similarly, Kumārila in his *Tantra-vārttika* on *Jaiminīya-Sūtra*, I. 3. 30 remarks :

*padāt prabhṛti yā caṣṭa prajñā jñātur vijñmbhate |
puṣpitaḥ sū padārtheṣu vākyaṛtheṣu phaliṣyati ||*

— as quoted by Jayanta in his *Nyūya-māñjarī*, Vol. I, p. 372. The latter takes his cue from Kumārila and elaborates the imagery further in the following verse clarifying the position of the *Mīmāṃsakas* regarding the process of verbal cognition : *seyaṃ vyutpatti-mūlaḥ pada-visara-samud-bhidyamānānkuraśrīḥ | saṃskārodāra-patrā kusumacayavati phollasadbhīḥ padārthaiḥ | prajñā-vallī viśālā phalati phalam idam svāduvākyaṛtha-tattvaih | nairākāṅkṣyaṃ lasadbhir hṛdayam upagate yānti yasmin pumām saḥ ||* — *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 372.

- 10 "This is the first step in the ladder leading to liberation, this the straight royal road for all those who desire salvation".

Now, it might be legitimately asked : What sort of salvation (*apavarga*) is aimed to be achieved by the study of Grammar? We can understand the nature of *apavarga* which stands out as the goal of such philosophical systems as *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika*, *Sāṃkhya-Yoga* and *Vedānta*, which is conceived as *duḥkḥātanta-nivṛtti*, though the nature of that goal has been interpreted differently in different systems. But what can be the nature of salvation set up by the theorists professing *śabda-tattva* as *Brahman*? And what is the path laid down by them for its attainment? Bhartṛhari has very thoroughly dealt with the all-pervasive character of the principle of speech (*vāk*) from the lowest level (*vaiikharī*) reaching upto its highest and subtlest - viz. *paśyantī*. But he is not so very thorough or methodical as regards the nature of salvation or the path leading to it.

As in the case of other philosophical systems the final realisation of the ultimate goal depends upon spiritual discipline leading to concentration of mind by making it averse to everything that is non-essential. This control of mind and its faculties by turning them inward (*pratyak*) and restraining them from being engrossed by things external (*parāk*) is known as *Yoga*, which is defined by Patañjali as *Yogaś citta-vṛtti-nirodhaḥ*. This *Yoga* as propaedeutic to the attainment of salvation, which consists in complete freedom and release from all kinds of bondage in the form of ignorance and doubt, is accepted not by a particular philosophical sect alone, but by all philosophical systems irrespective of their respective metaphysical or religious affiliation, to the exclusion of Cārvākas and Mīmāṃsists.³¹ Thus,

31. "Although the *Yogasūtra*-s are written within the context of the Sāṃkhya School of Metaphysics, the focus throughout is on the analysis of the psychological processes commonly accepted by all of the various schools-orthodox and heterodox alike... T. H. Stcherbatsky, the eminent Russian scholar of Buddhism, observes that Yogic trance (*samāhdi*) and Yogic courses for the training of the mind in the achievement of *mokṣa* or *nirvāṇa*

(Continued on the next page)

it is but quite expected that the Grammarians, too, should adopt the methods and techniques of Yoga-psychology which was availed of by most of the time-honoured philosophical traditions as a means towards attainment of *apavarga*, *mokṣa* or *nirvāṇa*, whatever might be the designation of that state of liberation. It is true that Bhartṛhari has not discussed in detail the stages through which our mind has to pass from the level of *vaikhari* to that of *paśyanti*, but there are traces in the *Vākyapadīya* and *ṛtti* thereon which can help us reconstruct the process of gradual liberation. We find the expression *śabdapūrva-yoga* (*śabda-pūrvena yogena*) employed in *Vākyapadīya*, I. 20, which has been translated by Professor Iyer as *Yoga preceded by the knowledge and use of the correct forms of word*. But the expression *śabdapūrva-yoga* is most probably equivalent to *śabda-yoga*, like *karma-yoga*, *jñāna-yoga* and *bhaktiyoga*, and is nothing but a variant of *vāg-yoga* which occurs in the expression *vāgyoga-vid* in the verse cited by Patañjali in the *Paspaśā*. It is an elliptical expression for *śabda-yoga* and has its parallel in such usages as *daśa-pūrva-ratham yam ākhyayā**, *deva-pūrvam girim te* of Kālidāsa and *hiranya-pūrvam kaśipum pracakṣate** of Māgha for *Daśaratha*, *Devagiri* and *Hiranya-kaśipu* respectively.³² Again in the *ṛtti* on *Vākyapadīya*, I. 14 :

(Continued from previous page)

(*yoga-mārga*) appear in virtually all schools of thought — be they Hindu, Buddhist or Jaina. And Mircea Eliade in his well-known book : *Yoga Immortality and Freedom*, maintains that Yoga is one of the four basic motifs of all Indian thought. " — Coward, *Op. cit.*, p. 54. The other three motifs named by Eliade are *karma*, *māyā*, and *nirvāṇa*. See Eliade, *Op. cit.*, chapter three, note 4.

32. This sort of elliptical usage has been regarded as a poetic defect known as *avācya-vacana* by Ālaṃkārikas. While commenting on *Śiṣupāla-vadha*, I. 42 Mallinātha observes :

yaṃ daityaṃ hiraṇya-pūrvam kaśipum pracakṣate | hiraṇya-kaśipum āhur ity arthaḥ | atra hiraṇya-śabda-pūrvatvaṃ kaśipu-śabdasyaiva na tu sañjñīnas tadarthasya iti śabda-paraśya kaśipu-śabdasyārthagatatvenāprayojyasya prayogād avācya-vacanākhyaṛtha-doṣam āhuḥ | 'yad evāvācyavacanam avācya-vacanam hi tad' iti samādhānam | evamāvidha-viśaye śabdapareṇārthalakṣaṇeti kathaṃcīt saṃpādyam — ity uktam asmābhiḥ | 'deva-pūrvam girim te' iti, 'dhanur-upapadam asmai vedam abhyādīdeśa' ity etad-vyākhyānāvasare sañjivanyām ghaṇṭāpathe ca |
.... — Sarvaṃkaṣṭhā.

tad dvāram apavargasya vān-malāmām cikitsitam

the same expression *śabdapūrva-yoga* is found to be employed and the different stages of that *yoga* are succinctly indicated in the following excerpt :

*śabdapūrvam hi śabda-svarūpasyābheda-tattvajñāḥ
kramasamhāreṇa yogaṃ labhate | sādhu-prayogāc cā-
bhivyakta-dharma-viśeṣaḥ mahāntaṃ śabdātmānam
abhisambhavan vaikaraṇyaṃ prāpnoti | so 'vyatikīrṇāṃ
vāg-avasthām adhigamya vāg-vikārāṇāṃ prakṛtiṃ
pratibhāṃ anuparaiti | tasmāc ca sattānugūṇya-mātrāt
pratibhākhyāt śabdapūrva-yoga-bhāvanābhyāsākṣepāt
pratyastamita-sarva-vikārollekha-mātrāṃ parāṃ pra-
kr̥tiṃ pratipadyate ||*³³

By the practice of *śabda-yoga*, the first step of which is the study of the correct form of speech as described and analysed in Grammar, a follower of this *yoga* becomes free from all pollutions (*mala*) attaching to his mind through the use of incorrect and impure speech and the subtle impressions thereof, and gradually rises to the level of *pratibhā*, or pure consciousness, the very womb of the phenomenal creation, in which all differences are merged, and which is Great Soul, the *Verbum*, constantly shining within us where there is no darkness in the form of ignorance, and where the distinction of *mūrti* and *vyāpāra* –

33. Dr. K. A. S. Iyer's note on this verse deserves consideration : " This verse is understood in the *vṛtti* as describing the stages through which the grammarian goes in attaining *mokṣa*. Vṛ. says : *etasyā eva brahma-
prāptēḥ kramam idānīm varṇayan nāha – avyavakīrṇām iti*. Some, however, think that different forms of liberation are set forth here.

" One thing to be noted is that Bhartṛhari, in the *vṛtti*, speaks about going from *pratibhā* which is understood by Vṛ. as *paśyantī*, to *parā-
prakṛtiḥ*. *Paśyantī* itself is called *sarva-vikārāṇāṃ prakṛtiḥ*. Thus *paśyantī* is *prakṛti* and after that comes *parā prakṛtiḥ*." — *Vākyapadīyam of Bhartṛhari*, note I on l. 14,

form and activity, is no longer traceable.³⁴ *Vāk*, according to Bhartṛhari, is the *parā-prakṛti*, and as *paśyantī* it is identical with *pratibhā*, which again is equivalent to *praṇava*, which is *śabda-brahman* itself. So, when the Yogin affiliated to the path of *śabdapūrvaka-yoga* or *vāg-yoga*, gradually rises to the level of *paśyantī* by getting rid of the impurities in the form of differentiation, spatial and temporal sequence, distinction between *sādhya*, *sādhana*, and *siddhi*, *draṣṭṛ*, *dṛśya* and *darśana*, *kartr*, *kārya* and *kāraṇa*, he becomes completely identified with the Supreme Deity (*mahān devaḥ*), *śabda-tattva*, that is ever shining and illuminating the universe in all its seeming diversities, which are nothing but *vivarta*-s or illusory manifestations serving only to keep us in constant bondage by concealing the true nature of our consciousness which is inalienable from that *parā vāk*. To rise to that state of supreme illumination one has to practise *yoga*, also described as *kramasamhāra-yoga*, which lifts him gradually from the level of *prāṇa* to the highest level where union with the Supreme Illumination (*parā-jyotiḥ*) is achieved. That is the highest goal, the attainment of Supreme Good (*kṣema-prāpti*).³⁵ In that state of Supreme Union all bonds are severed (*chinna-bandhana chinna-grantha*). This is *brahma-sāyuiya* - union with *brahman*, which is also the goal of *Advaita Vedānta*.

34. We have also a description of the nature of final illumination in the verses cited in the *vṛtti* on *Vākya-pāṇīya*, I. 1 and 142 introduced with the remarks : *tathā hy uktam* and *tatrethāseṣu nidarśanāny upalabhyante* respectively. The expression *śabda-pūrvaka-yoga* occurs also in the *vṛtti* on I. 142 : *tasyā eva vāco vyākaraṇena sādhitva-jñāna-labhyena vā śabdapūrvaka-yogenādhiḡamya - ity ekeṣū āgamah*. In the *vṛtti* on *Vākya-pāṇīya*, I. 131 we have again the expression *śabda-pūrvaka yoga : tadabhyāsāt ca śabda-pūrvakam yogam adhiḡamya pratibhāṃ tattvaprabhavām bhāva-vikāra-prakṛtiṃ sattvāṃ sādhyā-sādhana-śakti-yuktāṃ samyag-avabudhya niyatā kṣema-prāptir - iti*.

35. *Vide* : "The attributes whereby the Vedāntins describe Brahman or the absolute have all been used by Patañjali in his interpretation of *nitya-śabda*." — Dr. P. C. Cakravarti in *Cultural Heritage of India*, Vol. V. Patañjali in his *Paspaśū* on P. I. 1. 1 employs the epithets *dhruva*, *kūṭa-stha*, *avicālī*, *anapūyoḡajana-vikārt*, *avṛddhi*, *avyaya-yogī* that are frequently applied with reference to *para-brahman* in the *Upaniṣads*.

In the *vṛtti* on *Vākyapadīya*, I. 131 are quoted the following verses of unknown authorship, which describe the final state of illumination and are closely reminiscent of the Upaniṣadic saying :—

bhidyate hṛdaya-granthiś chidyante sarva-saṁśayāḥ |
kṣīyante cāśya karmāṇi tasmin dṛṣṭe parāvare ||
āha ca — prāṇa-vṛttim atikramya vācas tattve vyavasthitaḥ |
krama-saṁhārayogena saṁhṛtyātmānam ātmani ||
vācaḥ saṁskāram ādhāya vācam jñāne niveśya ca ||
vibhajya bandhanōny asyāḥ kṛtvā tām chinna-bandhanām ||
jyotir āntaram āśādy cchinna-granthi — parigrahaḥ ||
pareṇa jyotiṣaikatvam chittvā granthīn prapadyate ||

Bhartṛhari distinguishes between two kinds of *śabda* — one *kārya* or ephemeral and the other *nitya* or eternal. The nature of eternal *śabda* has been described in terms that are employed with reference to *para-brahman* by the Upaniṣadic seers in the following *vṛtti* — text on *Vākyapadīya*, I. 130. viz. : *api prayoktur ātmānam śabdāntar avasthitam...*, which deserves serious consideration :

nityas tu sarva-vyavahāra-yoniḥ saṁhṛta-kramāḥ sar-
veśām antaḥsannivesī prabhavo vikārāṇām āsrayaḥ
karmanām adhiṣṭhānam sukha-duḥkhaḥ sarvatrā-
pratihata-kāryaśaktir ghaṭādi-niruddha iva prakāśaḥ
parigṛhītabhogakṣetrāvadhiḥ sarva-mūrtinām aparī-
māṇā prakṛtiḥ sarva-prabheda-rūpatayā ca nitya-
pravṛtta-pratyavabhāsa-svapna-prabodhānukārī pra-
vṛtti-nivṛtti-padābhyām parjanyaḥ dāvāgnivac ca
prasavocchedaśaktiyuktaḥ sarvesvārāḥ sarvaśaktir
mahān śabda-vṛṣabhaḥ | tasmin khalu vāgyoga-vido
vicchidyāhaṁkāra-granthīn atyanta-vinirbhāgeṇa saṁ-
srjyante ||³⁶

36. The *krama* or sequence which is experienced with reference to speech as also the origin of phenomena in the material plane is only apparent and due to our nescience, which disappears when the highest

(Continued on the next page)

Bhartṛhari recognises two distinct stages in the path of realisation of spiritual purity (*śuddhi*) – one at the *upakrama* or beginning and the other at the end or *parisamāpti* in the following *kārikā* of the *Vākyapadīya* :

sarvārtha-rūpatā śuddhir jñānasya nirupāśrayā |
tato'pyasya parāṃ śuddhim eke prāhur arūpikām ||³⁷

The first stage consists in the simultaneous cognition of the entire cognisable universe as is possible in the case of the omniscient alone, independent of any operation of the sense-organs, while the final realisation of the Absolute *Śabda-brahman* as conceived by the philosophers of Bhartṛhari's system is of the nature of pure illumination, free from all traces of disturbance and beyond all differentiation as the *knower* and the *known*. As Helārāja clearly points out in his gloss on the *kārikā* just quoted :

dve daśe śuddher upakrama-parisamāpti-rūpe | indri-
yasannikarṣādi-rūpopāśraya-nirapekṣatayā-śeṣārthāva-

(Continued from the last page)

level of realization is attained, there being neither sequence nor origin in the level of *paśyantī*, where the ultimate reality or *brahman*, devoid of sequence (*akrama*) and of parts (*abhāga*) shines forth in which both speech and the meaning as its objective counterpart are merged in an undifferentiated totality. Compare :

atyadbhūtā tvityaṃ vṛttir yad abhāgaṃ yad akramam |
bhāgānām prāg abhūtānām ātma-tattvaṃ prakāśate ||

— *Vākyapadīya*, III, 3. 81.

See also : *akramah krama-rūpeṇa bhedaṃ iva lakṣyate ||*

— *Vākyapadīya*, I, 48 cd.

The concepts of *krama* and *krama-saṃhāra* in the states of nescience and final spiritual trance respectively are frequently alluded to in *Vākyapadīya*. Cf. *bhāgaśo bhajate kramam* (I, 51), *kramavān* in *vṛtti* on I. 3; *śabdākhyā uṣa-saṃhṛta-kramād brahmaṇaḥ* — *vṛtti* on I. 1; *kramapaśṣṭa-rūpā vāk* — I. 86; *pratisaṃhṛta-kramā .. paśyantī* — *vṛtti* on I. 142 etc.

37. Helārāja employs the same identical epithets with reference to *brahman* in his gloss on *Vākyapadīya*, III. 1. 32 : *antyā parā prakṛtiḥ satyā sarvaṇīkāranuyāyinī praśānta-kallolā cidekaghaṇā brahmety āgama-vidāḥ |* Similarly on *Vākyapadīya*, III. 7. 42 : *dyauiḥ kṣamā ... bahir-avasthitāḥ |* Helārāja observes : *ekam eva saṃvinnamayaṃ param śabda-brahma tathā tathā'vasthitam iti kārikārthaḥ*.

*bhāsa-khacitaṃ sarvajña-jñānam upakrame śuddham
ity ucyate | indriyādyapekṣā-rūpāyāḥ sva-viśayagra-
haṇe 'suddher anavagamāt | niṣṭhāyāṃ cākāra-kāluṣ-
yāpagamāt prabhāsvaram praśānta-kallolaṃ samvin-
mātram ekaghaṇaṃ śuddhaṃ grāhya-grāhaka-prapañ-
ca-śūnyaṃ param brahma ||*³⁸

This unique realisation is the essence of *Vāk* as *paśyanti*, which transforms Itself as *Vaikhari* for the purpose of communication and appears as *śabda*, *artha* and *sambandha*, though ultimately they are non-distinct. As Helārāja observes while commenting on *Vākyapadīya*, III. 2. 11 :

*samvic-ca paśyanti-rūpā parā vāk śabda-brahmamayī-
ti brahma-tattvam śabdāt pāramārthikān-na bhidyate |
vivarta-daśāyāṃ tu vaikhariyātmanā bhedaḥ ||*³⁹

This identity of *śabda*, *artha* and *sambandha* has been clearly pointed out in the following *kārikā* of *Vākyapadīya*, III. 2. 14 :

*tasya śabdārtha-sambandha-rūpam ekasya dṛśyate |
tad dṛśyaṃ darśanam draṣṭā darśane ca prayojanam ||*

Śabda is nothing but a potency of *cit* and as such indistinguishable from the latter. As Helārāja notes :

*iha śabdo nāma vācakaḥ sa ucyate yo'yaṃ cicchakteḥ
vāg-ātmā vyāpārah śabdanāpara-paryāyo'brūyamāno'
pi upāṃśu-prayoge śabda iti vyarahriyate yataḥ | tasya
prathamam udbhidyamānāvasthasyā-vibhāgāpanna-
śabdārthamaya-svabhāvasya para-vāgātmanā svarū-
peṇāvasthānam | paratas tu prānavṛtṭyanuprāṇita-
manobhūmi-samavalambita-nija-svabhāvasya vācya-*

38. Compare : *yat kila sarvāvasthāsv anugataṃ tad eva satyam | tac ca samvinmātra-rūpam abādhyamānam |* — Helārāja on *Vākyapadīya*, III. 2. 17-18. Also : *cit-sūmānyasya sarvatrānugamād eva mahāsattā-rūpam abhāvopratīyogi viśvasya jagataḥ satya-rūpam avadāta-darśanaiḥ sūkṣāt-kṛtyopadiṣṭam | pramāṇam nas te bhagavantaḥ |* — Helārāja on III. 1. 32.

39. Helārāja on *Vākyapadīya*, III. 3. 2.

*vācaka-rūpa-bhinna-śākhādvayāvalambinaḥ samavas-
thānam* //⁴⁰

According to Bhartṛhari's system all words refer to *brahman* or Absolute Reality, and in the ultimate analysis they are identical with It. Even words like *prithivī*, *ghaṭa* etc., that seem to refer to things distinct from *brahman*, have reference to the latter, though in a remote way, whereas words like *ātman*, *brahman* etc. are directly and immediately connected with the Supreme Reality, which is the core of all phenomenal appearance. As Bhartṛhari clearly states in the following *kārikā* (16) of the *Dravya-samuddheśa* section of the third *kāṇḍa* of *Vākyapadiya* :

*vācā sā sarva-śabdānāṃ śabdās ca na pṛthak tataḥ |
apṛthakte ca sambandhas tayor nānātmanor iva //*

40. While commenting on the *kārikā* 3. 2. 1 Helārāja points out how the words *ātman* etc. as used in different philosophical systems can be ultimately interpreted as referring to one identical substance as qualified by varying adjuncts. Cf. :

*tathā hi ātmādvaita-vādinibhir ātma-śabdena tad dravyaṃ nirū-
pyate ātmaiva hy-upādhi-bhinnaṃ pratibhāsamānam 'dravya-
padānām arthaḥ' — iti teṣāṃ darśanam ihaiva vakṣyamānam |
vastu svalakṣaṇam artha-kriyā-kāri dravyam iti śakyair uktam |
svabhāva — iti sattādvaita-vādinibhiḥ svabhāva ātma-bhūtā sattā —
iti kṛtvā | tathā hi kramarūpoḥa-saṃhāre sattvaiva sattvam iti
sva-sambandhibhir upādhibhir upahita-bhedā saiva dravyam |
prakṛter ekadeśaḥ celanaḥ puruṣaḥ tad-dvāreṇa śarīra-śarīriṇor
avyatirekāt śarīraṃ dravyam pradhānam eva prakṛtikaiḥ śarīram
evaikam ātmā yeṣāṃ taiḥ śarīrātmabhir ucyate | tattvam iti
caturbhūta-tattva-vādinibhiḥ Cārvākaiḥ dravyam ucyate | pṛthivy ap
tejo vāyur iti tattvāni | tatsamudāye ca śarīrendriya-viśaya-
saṃjñeti vacanāt | tad evam etaiḥ paramārthata ekam eva vastu
ucyate 'dravyam ity asya' -iti | dravyaṃ nāma yaḥ padārthaḥ
tasyaita eva paryāyāḥ | eteṣāṃ eva pūrmārthika-rūpābhidhāyī-
tvāt | nānye ghaṭādi-śabdāḥ |.....*

— Only we must keep in mind that *dravya* here refers to the Transcendental Eternal Substance (*pāramārthika-dravya*) and not to ordinary substances like earth, water, etc. (*sāmyavahārika-dravya*) with which we have to deal in our day-to-day life. Cf. : *īha tu pāramārthikaṃ dravyaṃ nirūpyate* — Helārāja. And it is this *pāramārthika-dravya* which is regarded as the connotation of words by the sage Vyāḍi : *dravyābhidhānam Vyāḍiḥ*. This *dravya* is eternal and immutable as Patañjali says in the *Paspaśū* : *dravyaṃ nityam ākṛtir anyā ūnyā ca bhavati*.

That Absolute or Supreme Reality is referred to in Bharṭṛhari's system as *ātman*, *vastu*, *svabhāva*, *śarīra*, *tattva* and *dravya* in different contexts as has been distinctly stated in the following *kārikā* (VP. III. 2. 1) :

*ātmā vastu svabhāvaś ca śarīraṃ tattvaṃ ityapi |
dravyam ity asya paryāyās tac ca nityam iti sthitaṃ ||*

That Supreme Reality pervades the entire universe as its substratum and manifests Itself as the phenomenal universe. Its *vivarta*, without any reality of its own, brought into being through the operation of Its intrinsic potencies (*śakti*-s) indistinguishable from their substratum, is within our own selves, nay It is our Self itself. It is supreme, un-differentiated consciousness, the Great Deity (*maho devaḥ*). And it is our destiny to retrieve our identity with that Supreme Reality or *tattva* which is none other than *paśyantī*. To attain to that state of beatific trance one has to pass through the various stages of psychic concentration as laid down in the *Yoga-sūtras* of Patañjali. A description of that final state of illumination as conceived by the Grammatico-philosophical school of Bharṭṛhari has been beautifully embodied in the following verse, which is usually cited by Sanskrit Poeticians as an illustration of the figure of speech *samāsokti* the process of Vedāntic illumination being *prima facie* super-imposed on the corresponding process of grammatical analysis :

*uditavati parasmīn pratyaye śāstra-yanau
gatahati vilayaṃ ca prākṛte'pi prapañce |
sapadi padam uditam kevala-pratyayo yas
tad iyaḍ iti mimāṇe ko hṛdā pañḍito'pi ||**

It is the *śiṣṭa*-s alone who are qualified to attain to that state of Supreme Illumination, where there is nothing other than pure consciousness in the shape of *paśyantī* endowed with its inalienable *vāk-śakti*, for they alone can visualise the truth. As Bharṭṛhari states :

*bhāva-tattva-dṛśaḥ śiṣṭāḥ śabdārtheṣu vyavasthitāḥ /
yad yad dharme 'ṅgatām eti līṅgaṃ tat tat pracakṣate //*⁴¹

And it is the Vaiyākaraṇas who are *śiṣṭa-s* par excellence. As Patañjali observes unambiguously :

śiṣṭā vaiyākaraṇāḥ / sāstra-pūrvikā hi śiṣṭiḥ / vaiyākaraṇās ca śāstrajñāḥ //^{*42}

Thus, through *śabda saṃskāra* or analytical procedure laid down in Grammar for enabling us to perform the act of communication necessary for our mundane existence and faithful observation of the procedure of psychic concentration, which, in the context of Bhartṛhari's system is called *śabda pūrvaka yoga*, we gradually attain to the status of *śiṣṭa-s*, having the power to gain a glimpse of the Ultimate beatific vision, consisting in liberation from the bonds of ignorance, pulling us down to the level of phenomenal existence. As it is laid down in one of the verses cited in the *vṛtti* on *Vākyapadīya*, I. 142 :

*tasyām dṛṣṭa-svarūpāyām adhikāro nivartate /
puruṣe ṣoḍaṣa-kale tām āhur amṛtām kalām //*

It is for this reason that Puṣpadanta, the great Gandharva chief, prays that he might be born again in the family of grammarians, if he has to appear in mortal coil on earth due to the curse of the Supreme Goddess, in the following memorable verse cited by Jayanta Bhaṭṭa in his *Nyāya-mañjarī*, while discussing the utility of Grammar as a separate discipline, and as an ancillary to the Vedic lore :

41. *Vākyapadīya*, III. 13. 21. This definition of *śiṣṭa-s* is quite in accord with Patañjali's pronouncement in his *Bhāṣya* on P. VI. 3. 109 : *prṣadarādīni yathopadiṣṭam* – viz. *etasmīnmūrya-nivāse ye brāhmaṇāḥ kumbhādhūnyāḥ aloluṣṭāḥ agrhyamūṇakaraṇā kiñ cid antareṇa kasyās cid vidyāyāḥ pūragās tatra bhavantaḥ śiṣṭāḥ* | — Kielhorn's Edn., Vol. III, p. 174.

42. *Mahābhāṣya*, Loc. cit., The term *śiṣṭa* has been employed by Bhartṛhari on numerous occasions to refer to the grammarians who are the acknowledged authorities on problems relating to speech. See *Vākyapadīya*, I. 27, 29; III. 13. 21; III. 14. 80.

*bhraṣṭaḥ śāpena devyāḥ śivapura-vasateḥ
 vandyaham mandabhāgyaḥ
 bhāvyam vā janmanā me yadi
 mala-kalile martyaloke saśoke |
 mugdhābhir dugdhadhārāmala-madhura-
 sudhābindu-nṣyandinībhiḥ
 kāmam jāyeya vaiyākaraṇabhaṇitibhis
 tūrṇam āpūrṇa-karṇaḥ ||⁴³*

Thus, we might conclude our dissertation by quoting the highly cogent observations of the late Dr. Prabhat Chandra Chakravarti :

“No grammarian seems to have gone further than Bharṭṛhari in harmonising grammatical speculations with the sublime teachings of Advaita philosophy.”⁴⁴

One might dispute Bharṭṛhari's claim that Ultimate Reality is Logos or Eternal Verbum, but the realisation of a Yogin having a vision of the ultimate truth carries its own indisputable validity in spite of the apparent inconsistencies that might be discerned therein in the level of our discursive reasoning. As it has been beautifully set forth in the following verse of the *Yoga-vāśiṣṭha* :

*yogino viditātmano bhāvayanti yathaiṣa tat |
 tat tathaiṣāśu paśyanti dṛḍha-bhāvanayā tayā ||⁴⁵*

43. *Nyāya-mañjarī*, Vol. I, p. 392. A similar benedictory verse glorifying *prātibha* – intuition reminiscent of the Grammarians' doctrine is worth mentioning here :

*yasmin sammukhatām prayāti ruciram ko 'py antar-ujjṛmbhate
 nedīyān mahimā manasy abhinavaḥ pumsaḥ prakāśātmanah |
 tṛptim yat paramām tanoti viśayāsvadam vinā śāśvatīm
 dhāmānanda-sudhāmayorjita-rāpus tat prātibham saṁstumah ||*

44. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's remarks in his *Śabda-kaustubha* with reference to Bharṭṛhari's monistic conception of the Absolute in the form of Logos deserve our consideration in this context :

*varāṇīkāṁveśanāya pravṛttaś cintāmaṇim labdhavān iti Vāśiṣṭha-
 Rāmāyaṇoktābhāṇaka-nyāyena śabda-vicārāya pravṛttaḥ saṁ prasāṅgād
 advaite brahmanyāpi vyutpadyatām – ity abhiprāyeṇa bhagavān Bharṭṛharir
 vivartavādādikam api prasāṅgād vyudapādayat |*

45. *Yoga-vāśiṣṭha* : *Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa*, I, 82. 24,

Bhartṛhari's doctrine of *śabdādvaita-vāda*, thus, deserves serious consideration of modern philosophers of language, emphasising as it does the fundamentally spiritual character of speech lying at the basis of all our thought-processes and pragmatic activities.⁴⁶ As one of the modern Western scholars remarks :

"In spite of the importance of language as the distinguishing feature of human consciousness and the medium through which all human knowledge passes, the study of linguistics and the philosophy of language in the West has only been seriously pursued in recent times. Today's modern scientific study suffers from focussing on the outer words especially in the written form. Even a cursory look at the long and fully developed Indian study of language strongly suggests that the nature of the language may be more complex and powerful than modern thought would lead us to suspect."⁴⁷

46. We might quote here Walt Whitman's words : "All words are spiritual, nothing is more spiritual than words". — cited by Ogdian and Richards in *Meaning of Meaning*, p. 24, (London, 1956).

47. Howard G. Coward : *The Śoṭa Theory of Language : A Philosophical Analysis*, p. 15 (Motilal Banarsidass, 1st Ed., Delhi, 1980). Compare also : "The Philosophical Analysis of Language is not just a logical exercise, to satisfy intellectual curiosity, but an earnest and sustained spiritual approach to identify oneself with the Basic Ground of Word Phenomena, with *Śabda-brahman*. Bhartṛhari elaborates this approach as *Śabda-yoga* or *Śabda-pūrvaka-yoga*, and in this sense Grammar is a Straight Pathway to Freedom (*mokṣamānānām ajihmā rāja-paddhatiḥ*). " — Prof. T. R. V. Murti, Foreword, *Op. cit.*, p. xiv. We might refer in this connection to Sister Nivedita's *The Master as I saw him*, Chap. XV ('On Hinduism') pp. 145-46, for the theory of creation of the universe out of ideas and its comparison with Plato's philosophy as interpreted by Swami Vivekananda in *The Complete works of Sister Nivedita*, Vol. I (Birth Centenary Publication, Sister Nivedita Girls' School, Calcutta, Second Edition, March 1972). Compare also : This is the thought-background of Yama's eulogy of *Om* as the symbol of Ātman in verses 15-17 of the Second Chapter of the *Kaṭha-Upaniṣad*. The eulogy is meant for both *Om* and Ātman, since we have seen that what fits one fits also the other. Explaining the significance of *Om* as the highest symbol of God, Swami Vivekananda says :

(Continued on the next page)

(Continued from the last page)

"All this expressed sensible universe is the form, behind which stands the eternal inexpressible *Sphoṭa*, the manifest as Logos or Word. The eternal *Sphoṭa*, the essential eternal material of all ideas or names, is the power through which the Lord creates the Universe. Nay, the Lord first becomes combined with *Sphoṭa*, and then evolves Himself out as the yet more concrete sensible universe. This *Sphoṭa* has one word as its only possible symbol, and this is the *Om*. And as by no possible means of analysis can we separate the word from the idea, this *Om* and the eternal *Sphoṭa* are inseparable; and therefore, it is out of this holiest of all holy words, the mother of all names and forms, the eternal *Om*, that the whole universe may be supposed to have been created .. The *Sphoṭa* is the material of all words, yet it is not any definite word in its fully formed state. That is to say, if all peculiarities which distinguish one word from another be removed then what remains will be the *Sphoṭa*; therefore this *Sphoṭa* is called *nāda-brahman*, the Sound-Brahman...

"If properly pronounced, this *Om* will represent the whole phenomena of sound-production, and no other word can do this; and this, therefore, is the fittest symbol of the *Sphoṭa*, which is the real meaning of *Om*. And as the symbol can never be separated from the thing signified, the *Om* and the *Sphoṭa* are one. And as the *Sphoṭa*, being the finer side of the manifested universe, is nearer to God, and is indeed the first manifestation of divine wisdom, this *Om* is truly symbolic of God." —Swami Vivekānanda : Complete Works, Vol. III, 8th Edn., pp. 57-58 (*Bhakti-Yoga*).

The contribution of the Hindu Grammarians in the field of philosophy of language has been highly eulogised by the doyen of modern linguistics, Roman Jakobson, the Central figure of the Prague School, in the following extract :

"It would certainly be wrong to ignore the brilliant insights concerning the role of sounds in language, which can be found scattered through the works of thinkers of Antiquity and of the Middle Ages, for example those of Thomas Aquinas, who was among the most profound of philosophers of language : and it would equally be wrong to ignore the subtle observations of the Ancient Oriental, and above all, Hindu, grammarians." — *Six Lectures on Sound and Meaning* (translated from the French with a Preface by C. Lévi-Strauss, The Harvester Press Ltd., 1978, 2 Stanford Terrace, Hassocks, Sussex, Great Britain), p. 4.

